

Prokofiev's *Romeo and Juliet* and Socialist Realism: a Case-Study in Inter-semiotic Translation¹

Karen Bennett
Catholic University of Portugal

In the great social experiment that was the Soviet Union of the 1930s, a very important role was accorded, as we know, to the writers, artists and composers of the regime. These were expected to be the prophets and guides of socialism, engineering human souls in the task of “ideological reformation and education of the working masses”;ⁱ and from around 1934, proclamations began to appear about how this should best be achieved. Andrei Zhdanov, the secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Russian Communist Party, announced to the Union of Soviet Writers that literature was expected to “organise the working masses and the oppressed in a struggle for the ultimate demolition of all exploitation and of the yoke of hired slavery”;ⁱⁱ consequently, it had to be permeated with enthusiasm and heroic optimism, focusing upon heroes that were actively engaged in the construction of a new way of life. The non-literary arts, too, were expected to contain a clearly identifiable ideological content and deal with humanistic themes that were edifying and inspiring for the people; but just how this was to be achieved in a medium like music, was not made explicit. Indeed, it is perhaps only in retrospect that the notion of socialist realism as applied to music has gained any sort of coherence; for during the 1930s, when it was effectively being defined, composers had to work on a trial and error basis, never knowing what the official reaction would be.

¹ Published in *Shakespeare and European Politics*, Dirk Delabastita, Josef de Vos, Paul Franssen (Eds), University of Delaware Press, 2008, pp. 318-328.

Another aspect of Soviet policy urged by Zhdanov in his 1934 speech to the Union of Soviet Writers was the systematic appropriation of canonical works from the past, with the dual objective of affirming the veracity of official ideology while simultaneously establishing Soviet artists as the culmination of a tradition that stretched back into the mists of time. Shakespeare was one of the most appreciated of these “Great Precursors of Communism” and his works were frequently adapted to the new politics. This typically involved the introduction of more crowd scenes to represent the proletarian element and the expansion of the comic parts of the tragedies to give them a more optimistic tone, with a sharpening of the contrast between good and evil characters in order to reflect the antagonism between the progressive and archaic elements of society.

Romeo and Juliet, along with *Hamlet*, was a particular favourite and there were several productions of the play during the Soviet era. However, Prokofiev’s decision to compose a ballet score based on it was almost certainly not ideologically inspired. Indeed, the idea for the ballet did not in fact come from the composer himself; it was Sergey Radlov, artistic director of the Leningrad State Academic Theatre of Opera and Ballet, who first approached the composer with the idea in December 1934.

Before it could come to fruition, however, the project suffered a number of setbacks that have never been fully explained. Shortly after work had begun on it, in 1935, it was abandoned, when Radlov was forced to leave the Leningrad State Academic Theatre as part of an administrative reshuffle in the wake of the assassination of Kirov; then early the following year, having been taken up by the Bolshoi Company, it was dropped for a second time, despite the fact that the piano score had been approved and performance was scheduled for the spring. Whether this reflects some uncertainty on the part of the authorities about its ideological soundness, as Jaffé suggests,ⁱⁱⁱ is not clear. It was, however, a very difficult time politically for Soviet composers, because a crisis had just erupted over Shostakovitch’s opera *Lady Macbeth of Mzensk*, and all sorts of works were being condemned as “formalistic” in a frenzy of denunciations. *Romeo and Juliet* may just have been too ill defined to risk being offered to the public at such a sensitive time.

Indeed, although the first of the three orchestral suites based upon material from the ballet was premiered in Moscow at the Bolshoi in November 1936, the ballet itself was not performed in Russia until 1940, after it had already become a

success abroad. Even then, things did not run smoothly. The dancers, who were unused to the syncopated rhythms and unusual orchestration, deemed it “undanceable”, and Prokofiev was requested to make alterations. Finally on 11th January 1940, the ballet was presented at the Kirov, with the leading roles danced by Galina Ulanova and Konstantin Sergeyev, a production that remained the work of reference for some time.

The Form of the Ballet

It may have been the tense political climate at the time that almost led to the implementation of one of the most controversial changes that could have been made in relation to this play, namely the decision to give the ballet a happy ending, with Romeo returning a minute sooner, and finding Juliet alive. This was eventually revoked, however, and the final version is largely faithful to the Shakespeare play. Of course, owing to the particular requirements of ballet dramaturgy, the play had to be abridged, and Shakespeare’s five acts of twenty-four scenes were divided into (originally) fifty-eight short episodes with a descriptive title for each, allowing the possibility of creating sharply contrasting moods in a short period. Scenes are presented in almost the same order as the original, although they are grouped differently, with Act II beginning only after the Balcony Scene in the ballet, for example; interestingly, the whole of the final scene in the tomb is presented as Epilogue. Scenes that lend themselves particularly well to dance have been considerably extended (the fights, and the ball scene notably) and a number of folk-dances have been included in order to allow the chorus to demonstrate its virtuosity.

Narrative structure is created musically through the use of Leitmotif, a technique developed by Wagner for opera. This involves the allocation of musical themes to characters and to dramatic ideas, basic melodies that are then altered (rhythmically, harmonically, melodically and through orchestration) to reflect shifting interactions and emotional states. Most of the characters in *Romeo and Juliet* are identified by at least one portrait theme, and there is a clear division between those that develop musically and those that do not, suggesting an interesting comparison with the realist novel. There are also abstract themes like Love, Death and Strife, which in many cases develop out of the character themes, thus providing an interesting musical illustration of the Romantic notion that plot develops out of character.

Prokofiev introduced a number of alterations to Shakespeare's play, but easily the most important is on the level of character, involving a shift in perspective that has far-reaching implications. In the original play, the tragedy is a social, not individual, matter that afflicts the two households equally; the perspective is panoramic, not partisan, and character is firmly subordinated to action. In Prokofiev's version, on the other hand, we are given a perspective much closer to that of the nineteenth century novel. The plot is now centred upon an individual hero (Romeo), and the narrative becomes the tale of his personal development in the face of obstacles. All the other characters are perceived as they relate to him; Juliet and Mercutio develop too but are fragmented and unrounded; the Nurse and Friar Laurence are mere caricatures, and Tybalt almost disappears altogether, subsumed into the anonymous mass of enmity that is the Capulet clan.

This difference in focus is evident from the very start of the work. In Shakespeare's Prologue, it is the feud between the two families that is presented as the theme of the play. Prokofiev's Overture, on the other hand, does not speak of enmity. He could have used bellicose passages such as the Knight's Theme, elements from 'The Fight', or even the ominous episode known as 'The Duke's Order' to create a sense of conflict and tragic premonition; instead it is the lyrical 'Romeo and Juliet' Theme that has precedence, interspersed with fragments from Juliet's B Theme and the Love Theme. The overwhelming tone is thus romantic and poignant, which unequivocally summarizes the work as a tale of love. Thus, its scope is reduced from the social plane to the private domain of the psyche, and the panoramic vision is narrowed down to the partial perspective of one individual soul.

Romeo's prominence becomes evident almost as soon as the ballet opens. While in Shakespeare, he is introduced to us only at the end of Scene I, after the fight and the Prince's warning, in Prokofiev's version he is the first figure to appear upon the stage. Across the ballet as a whole, he is present in over 70% of the musical episodes, which gives him a much more centralised role than he has in the original play.

This dramatic prominence is reflected musically by the enormous development undergone by Romeo's Theme. When he first appears on stage in the ballet, he is a very different character from the lovesick young romantic of Shakespeare. The first rendition of his theme (N°2) portrays him as foolish, gauche, even bawdy, and it is contact with Juliet and with the Courtly theme associated with Paris that causes it to mutate and evolve, until it eventually blossoms into the graceful Love Theme. Thus, we have a kind

of Ugly Duckling story superimposed onto Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, and it is significant that the transformation is attributed to the alchemy of love.

There is no other character in the ballet whose theme changes so dramatically. Juliet is presented in a fragmented way, with three themes, each representing a different facet of her nature; Mercutio has his own portrait theme but is also associated closely with two group themes; the Nurse and Friar Laurence are no more than caricatures, with static simple themes that highlight a single trait; and most of the other characters disappear into an undifferentiated mass. Thus, Prokofiev has managed to achieve musically the kind of characterisation that nineteenth century novelists strove for in words. He has drawn a rounded psychological portrait of the central protagonist who develops and grows throughout the course of the action, introduced secondary developing characters who are perceived in relation to the protagonist and are therefore fragmentary, and peopled the background with a series of static minor characters who serve only to personify some particular characteristic that is of interest to the protagonist at the moment.

One of the most important changes introduced by Prokofiev into Shakespeare's play is the minimization of Tybalt. Curiously, this character, who has such a pivotal role in Shakespeare's play, is not even given his own portrait theme but instead is subsumed into the general theme of clan enmity. We can only speculate as to his reasons for this. One answer might be that Prokofiev did in fact intend this ballet to have a happy ending (also suggested by restructuring of scene boundaries, and by the absence of strife imagery in the Overture). Tybalt, as Susan Snyder has pointed out,^{iv} is the only truly tragic character in Shakespeare's play; it is essentially his intervention that transforms *Romeo and Juliet* from a romantic comedy into a tragedy, since, up to the death of Mercutio, the action could have developed in a completely benign direction. Thus, diminishing this character's importance would automatically diminish the tragic potential of the play, and make a happy ending all the more plausible, if that were in fact the composer's intention.

On the other hand, there could be ideological reasons for the reduction of Tybalt's role. Since he is effectively the catalyst of the tragic action, the character has frequently been interpreted as the devilish agent of a dark Fate (and indeed, there are several hints in the play that the catastrophe is somehow preordained). Reducing Tybalt's role thus effectively de-activates fatalistic or supernatural interpretations of the tragedy and returns the action to the merely social plane. By not allowing him a theme

of his own, his potential as freethinking individual and satanic provocateur is dramatically reduced; instead, the role of villain is taken over musically by the whole clan, or rather, by the feudal society that propagates such tribal strife. Thus, it is these that become the tragic forces in the ballet, a transformation of Shakespeare's vision that is perhaps significant in the light of the regime in which Prokofiev lived.

Ideological Underlay

On the broader plane, however, determining the ideology underlying the musical discourse of Prokofiev's *Romeo and Juliet*, and indeed the composer's relationship with the regime generally, is not at all an easy matter. For, despite the celebration of the work by the Soviet authorities following its great success abroad, it is by no means clear that it does in fact abide by the norms of Socialist Realism; indeed the early fortunes of the ballet would indicate that perhaps the authorities themselves were uncertain about its status, as we have suggested.

Prokofiev himself has in fact been appropriated by both sides of the ideological divide. Two Russian biographies published in English in the 1960s are in sharp contradiction as to his politics: *Prokofiev*, by I.V. Nestyev,^v the official Soviet version, paints him unequivocally as a son of the regime, and attempts to prove through detailed interpretations of his works that these are exemplary cases of socialist realism; while *Sergei Prokofiev – a Soviet Tragedy* by Victor Seroff takes the opposite line,^{vi} seeing him essentially as a non-conformist who was co-opted against his will. Other more recent non-Russian biographies, such as those by Claude Samuel (1971),^{vii} David Gutman (1988)^{viii} and Daniel Jaffé (1998)^{ix} wisely shy away from simplistic interpretations, preferring to reserve judgment on most of the politically delicate issues.

Neither is it easy to determine Prokofiev's political attitudes from the events of his life. The fact that he clearly enjoyed a privileged status and was showered with honours at a time when so many other composers were undergoing persecution would support Nestyev's argument. On the other hand, we cannot forget that, as early as 1936, his ballet *Le Pas d'Acier* was rejected as a "flat and vulgar anti-Soviet anecdote, a counter-revolutionary composition bordering on Fascism",^x while ten years later, he was officially accused of Formalism, and sacked from the directorate of the Soviet Composers' Union.

Musically, the composer is equally difficult to pin down and never so much as in *Romeo and Juliet*. Nestyev describes the composer's return to traditional tonality, upon his return to the Soviet Union in 1929, as a blossoming, brought about by his dawning awareness of the Truth residing in socialism;^{xi} Seroff, on the other hand, claims that Prokofiev's musical idiom is far from conformist, and that, according to the definition of "formalism" given by Nikolai Chelyapov to the Union of Soviet Composers in 1932, most of the composer's works "obviously should have been scrapped".^{xii} Jaffé takes a different line again. He points out that, following the undermining of the very infrastructure of tonality by avant-garde experimentalism, composers of the late 1920s were faced with a stark choice between finding "new ways of structuring their music" or somehow renovating past practices, and attributes Prokofiev's return to lyricism to the influence of Schopenhauer, whom the composer was reading at the time. He also claims that Prokofiev systematically used the semiotic potential inherent in tonality to provide an ironic subtext to even his most apparently conformist works (such as the infamous *October Cantata*), thus ultimately refusing to submit to the demands of the regime.^{xiii}

Whatever his reasons, however, Prokofiev's decision to make use of traditional tonality in this work was effectively an ideological act, since it represented conformism to Soviet aesthetics and a rejection of the alternative approaches to musical composition that were being developed elsewhere at the time. The decision to use this discourse in a representational way also aligned the composer with official cultural policy, since *Romeo and Juliet* is undoubtedly "realism", both in the sense that it aims to draw a faithful portrait of some extra-musical world, and also in its use of centralised perspective, which connects it firmly with realism in painting and literature. At a time when abstraction was in the ascendancy in all arts, this appears a very conservative approach and made it easy for Nestyev to imply that the ballet's greatness resulted from the fact that it was "done under new conditions, after the composer had joined his fate with the humanist Soviet culture".^{xiv}

The specifically Russian elements in *Romeo and Juliet* would also have ingratiated Prokofiev with the authorities. Renaissance Italy was evoked in the ballet only occasionally and unsystematically, and the dominant tone is distinctly Russian, evidence, for Nestyev, of the composer's talent "for projecting images derived from foreign sources through the spectrum of his own national sensibilities".^{xv}

There are aspects of the musical idiom of *Romeo and Juliet* that are less assimilable to the official line, however. Although the overall harmonic structure is clearly diatonic, the work does contain a great deal of dissonance that verges on atonality in places. This is used to create dramatic effects of anguish and foreboding so powerful that they would seem to entirely contradict the requirement that the tone be optimistic and edifying. It is interesting to note that one episode, which uses dissonance to express a foreboding of cosmic proportions, has been bathetically entitled ‘The Duke’s Order’ (Nº 7). Could this verbal tag be an attempt by the composer to constrain interpretations of this episode, playing down any possible references to a malignant Fate by making the feudal overlord into the source of dread instead?

The ending of the ballet also contains hints of unresolved harmonic tensions that contradict glibly optimistic interpretations. The melodic balance of Juliet’s dignified C theme, which finally reaches its full expression as she prepares herself to die, is distinctly undermined by the insertion of a discordant 9th between each rendering, a chord not considered legitimate in traditional tonality. Could this be interpreted as the kind of ironic subtext of the kind that Jaffé identified in the *October Cantata*? Certainly it is impossible to read anything heroic or triumphant into such an ending, even if we allow for the equilibrium suggested melodically by the fulfilment of Juliet’s C theme.

It is interesting to see how Nestyev has dealt with these aspects in the official biography. Insisting upon the composer’s loyalty to tonality, he implies that his use of dissonance merely serves as a foil to enhance the beauty of traditional harmonies.^{xvi} The “eerie-sounding interval” of the ninth is justified on the grounds that it connotes “grief and despair”,^{xvii} and Nestyev takes it for granted that this is appropriate in contexts such as death. However, he does not seem aware that admitting these emotions into the final bars of this ballet makes it impossible to argue that the work displays the kind of heroic optimism demanded by socialist realism. Consequently, this musicologist, in his anxiety to appropriate Prokofiev for the regime, has unwittingly argued himself into a knot, and we are left with the feeling that perhaps this work is not quite as neatly categorisable as he would have us think.

Elsewhere in the same chapter, he attributes Prokofiev’s harmonic non-conformism to a desire to “revitalize the expressive means of music”,^{xviii} and later suggests that it reveals “a more specific and meaningful purpose: to expose the

enemies of mankind, the misanthropes who murder and destroy”.^{xix} Among the list of “enemies of mankind” that follows this extract, Nestyev specifically mentions the “haughty, vengeful knights” of *Romeo and Juliet*. Here, as in the rest of his critical assessment of the ballet, he seems determined to demonstrate that Prokofiev has adequately polarised the characters into progressive and reactionary forces in required Socialist Realist fashion. Hence, we are told that “Romeo corresponds completely to Shakespeare’s conception of the hero, seized at first with romantic yearning and later displaying the flaming passion of a lover and the valor of a warrior”; Juliet develops into “a strong, selfless and loving woman”; Friar Laurence is a “humanist”; and Tybalt is “the personification of evil, arrogance, and class haughtiness” As for Mercutio, he is full of “bitter jests” that are, we understand, directed towards the overthrow of “medieval bigotry”.^{xx}

I would argue that there is much to take issue with in this characterization. For one, the opposing forces are not musically polarised in such a clear-cut fashion as Nestyev would have us believe; instead, characters are foregrounded or backgrounded from a centralised perspective, and the protagonists display a much greater internal complexity than would be permitted by the simple allegory suggested here. There are also points where the characterisation seems actively to contradict the official line. Paris, for example, considered to be a highly reactionary figure in socialist commentary, is given a particularly harmonious and balanced portrait theme, which actively influences Romeo’s in a positive way. Nor are the “people” idealized in the required fashion. Although there is a suitable abundance of crowd scenes (providing plentiful opportunities for the *corps de ballet*, of course), these subjects are not noticeably oppressed by the feudal strife; instead they enthusiastically participate in it, as we see in the gradual transformation of the two initial folk dances, ‘The Street Awakens’ (Nº 3) and ‘Dance in the Morning’ (Nº 4) into ‘The Quarrel’ (Nº 5) and then ‘The Fight’ (Nº6).

In some cases the musical semiotic is just not subtle enough to support Nestyev’s interpretations. For example, he claims that, in the characterisation of Friar Laurence, “there is neither churchly sanctity nor mystical remoteness; the music underscores the Friar’s wisdom, spiritual nobility and kindly love of people”:^{xxi} but just how the music manages to depict a spirituality that is specifically non-churchly, non-mystical and proletarian, he does not explain. Similarly, it is not clear exactly when or how Mercutio’s humour actually becomes “bitter”; my own analysis would

suggest that this character is mostly drawn playful and light, in order to provide a more marked contrast with Tybalt's rigidity.

The extent to which Romeo may be considered a socialist hero is worthy of some attention. Clearly the character has been foregrounded far more than in Shakespeare, and his theme undergoes an unprecedented development. But could he be said to be an "active participant in the proletarian struggle, idealized to the point of superhuman perfection, and displaying the internal coherence, courage, and love of life necessary to enable him to overthrow the forces of feudal prejudice"?^{xxii} I would say not. On his first appearance, he is portrayed as something of a buffoon, with a gauche, disjointed theme executed on that most comical instrument, the bassoon; and as we have seen, it is the acquisition of courtly graces (not proletarian virtues) that enable him to become worthy of Juliet's love. Even after his blossoming, he is associated with tunes that are above all sentimental and romantic, not heroic or militant. To my mind, therefore, Romeo's complexities align him with heroes of the Bildungsroman, rather than those of the socialist kind, types which are quite clearly distinguished by the ideologues.

Finally, what of the requirement that socialist realism be above all optimistic? To what extent has Prokofiev managed to turn Shakespeare's tragedy into a triumph for the forces of progress and light in the required Soviet manner?

Let us turn first to the question of the happy ending that was to be given to the tragedy at one point, but was later revoked. Could this have been an attempt by Prokofiev and Radlov to pander to the authorities on this issue? After all, the doctrine of socialist realism was still being defined at this time, and the Popov version of *Romeo and Juliet*,^{xxiii} which became the production of reference for many years, had not yet appeared. Could it be that, in the political climate of 1934-5, it just seemed too risky to stage a full-blown tragedy, and the authors took the only measures that occurred to them to bring their work into line with official decrees?

Prokofiev's officially sanctioned autobiography claims otherwise. "The reason for taking such a barbarous liberty with Shakespeare's play was purely choreographic," he wrote, "live people can dance, but the dying can hardly be expected to dance in bed",^{xxiv} justified on the grounds that Shakespeare himself was said to have been uncertain about the endings of his plays. Although this argument interestingly anticipates the case put forward by Susan Snyder that Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* is structurally a

comedy until the death of Mercutio,^{xxv} the decision was apparently not popular with Shakespearian scholars who protested vehemently against the travesty.

What can the musical text itself tell us about all this? For of course, in a well-formed work of art, the ending is not arbitrary, but is present at the very beginning, indeed is *determined* by artistic choices inherent to the structure. If Prokofiev had intended the ballet to be a romantic comedy then surely there would be some musical indication of that from the outset.

There is indeed some evidence of this. Firstly there is the matter of the Overture, which sets the tone for a tale of romance and not a tale of conflict or anguish; and secondly, there is the scenic restructuring, by means of which all the tragic material occurs in Epilogue as if it were hurriedly tagged on the end following a change of plan. These might be vestiges of that earlier draft of the work.

On the other hand, it is also true that the music does not sound like “true happiness”, as Prokofiev himself acknowledged in the quotation above. Many of the themes associated with the lovers (such as the Main ‘Romeo and Juliet’ Theme, the Love Theme, and Juliet’s C Theme) contain strong overtones of pathos or yearning, which clearly would be inappropriate in a comedy. Could it be then that the composer himself was divided on this issue, emotionally committed to a tale of thwarted love, even while he was structuring the work as comedy?

In the end, of course, we will never know what Prokofiev’s intentions truly were when he wrote this ballet. But perhaps this does not matter. What is more interesting in the end is the effect that the work has had upon the various contexts of reception, when analysed in terms of the Polysystem.^{xxvi} For while the ballet did not comply totally with the dominant cultural paradigm of the local system (Socialist Realism), it clearly found resonance in the global one. Its entire trajectory from the moment patronage was withdrawn to its subsequent rehabilitation within the Soviet canon can thus be interpreted in the light of a cultural interplay between centres and peripheries. This reveals a great deal not only about the balance of power in the world in the 1930s, but also about the values of a cultural system that continues to find it a source of delight in the 21st century.

Note on Contributor:

Karen Bennett lectures on Translation and Culture at the Catholic University, Viseu, Portugal, and is a member of the research team at the Centre for Comparative Studies, University of Lisbon. Her main interests are Translation Studies (especially Intersemiotic Translation) and Comparative Literature. Her publications include: 'The Seven Veils of Salomé: Wilde's Play in Portuguese Translation' in *The Translator Vol.9 Nº 1*, Manchester, 2003; 'The Recurrent Quest: Demeter and Persephone in Modern Ireland' in *Classical and Modern Literature*, 23/1, Chicago, 2003; 'The Duende in England: Lorca's "Blood Wedding" in Translation' in *Translation and Literature*, Vol. 11 Part 1, Edinburgh, 2002.

ⁱ From the Constitution of the Soviet Writers' Union. Cit. Shurbanov, A. & Sokolova, B. *Painting Shakespeare Red: An East-European Appropriation* (Associated University Presses, London & New Jersey), 2001, p.96.

ⁱⁱ *Idem*, pp. 83-104.

ⁱⁱⁱ Jaffé, D. *Sergey Prokofiev* (Phaidon, London) 1998, p.141.

^{iv} Snyder, S. 'The Comic Matrix of Romeo and Juliet' [1979] in Taylor, N. & Loughrey, B. (Eds) *Shakespeare's Early Tragedies*, (Macmillan, London), 1991, p. 170.

^v Nestyev, I.V. *Prokofiev* tr. Jones, F. (Stanford University Press, California), 1960.

^{vi} Seroff, V. *Sergei Prokofiev – a Soviet Tragedy* (Leslie Frewin, London), 1969.

^{vii} Samuel, C. *Prokofiev*, tr. M. John (Calder and Boyars, London), 1971

^{viii} Gutman, D. *Prokofiev* (The Alderman Press, London), 1988.

^{ix} Jaffé, D. *Sergey Prokofiev* (Phaidon, London), 1998.

^x *Idem*, p.118.

^{xi} Nestyev, I.V. *Prokofiev* tr. Jones, F. (Stanford University Press, California), 1960, p.454.

^{xii} Seroff, V. *Sergei Prokofiev – a Soviet Tragedy* (Leslie Frewin, London), 1969, p.216.

^{xiii} Jaffé, D. *Sergey Prokofiev* (Phaidon, London), 1998, p.149.

^{xiv} Nestyev, I.V. *Prokofiev* tr. Jones, F. (Stanford University Press, California), 1960, p.268.

^{xv} *Idem*, p.460.

^{xvi} *Idem*, p.467.

^{xvii} *Idem*, p.475.

^{xviii} *Idem*, p.466.

^{xix} *Idem*, p.471.

^{xx} *Idem*, pp.269-270.

^{xxi} *Idem*.

^{xxii} For a detailed description of the socialist hero, see Shurbanov, A. & Sokolova, B. *Painting Shakespeare Red: An East-European Appropriation* (Associated University Presses, London & New Jersey), 2001, p.99.

^{xxiii} *Idem*, pp. 101-4. This 1935 production finished with a brightening blue sky showing through the window of the charnel house indicating that, spiritually at least, the characters had all got what they deserved.

^{xxiv} cit. Seroff, V. *Sergei Prokofiev – a Soviet Tragedy* (Leslie Frewin, London), 1969, pp. 202-203, and Gutman, D. *Prokofiev* (The Alderman Press, London) 1988, pp.111-113.

^{xxv} Snyder, S. 'The Comic Matrix of Romeo and Juliet' [1979] in Taylor, N. & Loughrey, B. (Eds) *Shakespeare's Early Tragedies*, (Macmillan, London), 1991, p. 170.

^{xxvi} See Evan-Zohar, I. 'Polysystem Studies' in *Poetics Today: International Journal for Theory and Analysis of Literature and Communication*, Vol.11, No.1 Spring 1990.